

1 Derek W. Loeser (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
3 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200
4 Seattle, WA 98101
5 Tel.: (206) 623-1900
6 Fax: (206) 623-3384
7 dloeser@kellerrohrback.com

Lesley Weaver (Cal. Bar No.191305)
BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP
555 12th Street, Suite 1600
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel.: (415) 445-4003
Fax: (415) 445-4020
lweaver@bfalaw.com

5

6 || Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel

7 Additional counsel listed on signature page

8

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

11

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER
PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION

MDL No. 2843
Case No. 18-md-02843-VC-JSC

13

This document relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE A RESPONSE TO JOINT
DISCOVERY LETTER BRIEF
REGARDING TAR**

17

Judge: Hon. Vince Chhabria and
Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley
Courtroom: 4, 17th Floor

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7-11, Plaintiffs make the following four points in opposition
 2 to Defendant Facebook, Inc.’s Administrative Motion for Leave to File a Response to Joint
 3 Discovery Letter Brief Regarding TAR (“Administrative Motion”), Dkt. No. 704.

4 *First*, there is no reason to change the dispute-resolution process that the Court already
 5 established. The Court ordered the parties to submit either a TAR stipulation, or a joint letter on
 6 TAR, on July 2. (Dkt. No. 693.) The parties submitted a joint letter on July 2. Plaintiffs’
 7 attachments to the July 2 joint letter exceeded the prescribed 21 pages only because Plaintiffs
 8 included a proposed TAR protocol. If the Court would like that TAR protocol removed from the
 9 attachments to the joint letter and refiled instead as a proposed order, Plaintiffs will do so. The
 10 important point, in any event, is that the Court already established a briefing process for TAR and
 11 the parties complied with it in every way that matters. Facebook now wants this process to be
 12 altered. In a case already replete with delays and disputes, however, no further complications are
 13 warranted.

14 *Second*, Facebook insists further briefing is necessary because it was surprised by
 15 Plaintiffs’ acceptance of the need for TAR. But the clear presupposition of the Court’s order was
 16 that TAR would be used; otherwise, no stipulation or letter would be necessary in the first place.
 17 Plaintiffs were simply adhering to that presupposition. And Facebook already knew that Plaintiffs
 18 had accepted the need for TAR. It is false to say otherwise. After preliminary discussions with
 19 Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie in April, Plaintiffs agreed that using TAR made sense. Plaintiffs’
 20 agreement was then communicated to Facebook. Indeed, as requested by the mediators, Plaintiffs
 21 provided Facebook with a draft TAR protocol on May 21 and the parties continued to discuss
 22 until Facebook abruptly changed course and abandoned TAR. That was surprising. Plaintiffs’
 23 support for TAR, discussed at length by the parties through multiple mediation sessions, is not.

24 *Third*, Facebook asserts that Plaintiffs did not agree to blindly accept a mediator’s
 25 proposal until after they learned that Facebook had reversed course and rejected TAR. It is not
 26 made clear why this fact, even if true, makes further briefing necessary. Regardless, Facebook’s
 27 assertion is untrue. Plaintiffs agreed to accept whatever TAR protocol the Discovery Mediator
 28

1 proposed on June 23 but did not learn until June 28 that Facebook had reversed course and
 2 rejected TAR. It is possible that Facebook did not know that Plaintiffs had agreed to accept a
 3 mediator's proposal on June 23. (As is common with mediator's proposals, the discovery
 4 mediators here may have chosen not to inform Facebook of Plaintiffs' commitment since
 5 Facebook rejected the mediator proposal.) But Facebook would have learned this fact had it
 6 responded to Plaintiffs' request to meet and confer before it filed its Administrative Motion.¹

7 *Fourth*, further briefing is unnecessary because the parties have already said that they
 8 support the appointment of a special master under Rule 53. The TAR issue can and should be the
 9 first issue decided by the Special Master. This should not be a difficult task, since Mr. Garrie has
 10 discussed this matter with the parties for months, and already suggested that he would
 11 recommend a TAR protocol based on the parties' positions in the TAR discussions.

12 The Court should deny Facebook's Administrative Motion. If it grants it, Plaintiffs request
 13 permission to respond to its proposed letter brief.

14 Dated: July 19, 2021

15 KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

16 By: /s/ Derek W. Loeser
 17 Derek W. Loeser

18 Derek W. Loeser (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 19 Cari Campen Laufenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 David Ko (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Adele A. Daniel (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Benjamin Gould (SBN 250630)
 20 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200
 Seattle, WA 98101
 Tel.: (206) 623-1900
 Fax: (206) 623-3384
 dloeser@kellerrohrback.com
 claufenberg@kellerrohrback.com
 dko@kellerrohrback.com
 adaniel@kellerrohrback.com
 bgould@kellerrohrback.com

Respectfully submitted,

BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP

By: /s/ Lesley E. Weaver
 Lesley E. Weaver

Lesley E. Weaver (SBN 191305)
 Anne K. Davis (SBN 267909)
 Matthew S. Melamed (SBN 260272)
 Angelica M. Ornelas (SBN 285929)
 Joshua D. Samra (SBN 313050)
 555 12th Street, Suite 1600
 Oakland, CA 94607
 Tel.: (415) 445-4003
 Fax: (415) 445-4020
 lweaver@bfalaw.com
 adavis@bfalaw.com
 mmelamed@bfalaw.com
 aornelas@bfalaw.com
 jsamra@bfalaw.com

27 ¹ Plaintiffs give their permission for the Court to confer with Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie, and
 28 encourage Facebook to do the same, particularly now that Facebook has put the sequence of events
 at issue.

1 Christopher Springer (SBN 291180)
2 801 Garden Street, Suite 301
3 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
4 Tel.: (805) 456-1496
5 Fax: (805) 456-1497
6 cspringer@kellerrohrback.com

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel

1 **ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(i)(3)**

2
3 I, Derek W. Loeser, attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been
4 obtained from the other signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and
5 correct.

6 Executed this 19th day of July, 2021, at Seattle, Washington.

7
8 _____
9 Derek W. Loeser

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sarah Skaggs, hereby certify that on July 19, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California using the CM/ECF system, which shall send electronic notification to all counsel of record.

5 In addition, the following were served via email:

Anjeza Hassan
annie.sara@yahoo.com

/s/ Sarah Skaggs
Sarah Skaggs